



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Hanging of the Crane,' and 'Morituri Salutamur.' Portions of the 'Building of the Ship' have been quite extensively used in schools, but the whole poem has never appeared before in so cheap a form. To those who have read (and who have not?) the 'Paradise for Children' in Hawthorne's 'Wonder Book' (see number 17 of the same series), which tells the story of Pandora's Box, the 'Masque of Pandora' will be especially interesting. The 'Morituri Salutamur' was written for the celebration of the fiftieth anniversary of Longfellow's graduation from Bowdoin College, and is considered one of his best poems. 'The Hanging of the Crane' is too well known to need more than a passing mention. These poems, while simple enough for children of the Fourth Reader grade, will be enjoyed by all lovers of Longfellow, and by all admirers of good poetry. These poems are accompanied by very carefully prepared notes, which, without being voluminous, will be found helpful at just the places where help is needed.

— In *Science*, No. 299, page 198, first column, 14th line from the top of the page, for 'house-leek,' read 'hawk-weed.'

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR.

On Alleged Mongoloid Traits in the American Race: In Reply to Dr. Ten Kate.

IN the last number of *Science*, Dr. Ten Kate makes a series of strictures on the paper I read before the American Association for the Advancement of Science, entitled 'On the Alleged Mongoloid Affinities of the American Race.' These strictures close with some sentences which I should think a scientific mind would hesitate to write, as certainly a scientific mind will refuse to accept, — sentences to the effect that any one who differs from the opinions expressed by the writer of those strictures cannot believe in either anthropology or natural history. In spite of this *egomet dixi*, I venture to retain my opinion, and even to defend it.

But first let me state clearly what were the aim and limit of my paper.

These were simply that *in our present state of knowledge* there is no sufficient ground, either in language, in culture, or in ethnic anatomy, for the oft-repeated assertion that the American Indians belong to the Mongolian sub-species of the species *Homo*. What future researches may prove, such as those of Dr. Ten Kate, I do not pretend to say; and I distinctly avoided his example of basing present theories on imagined prospective discoveries (see his remarks in his footnote).

Some of his arguments are so extraordinary that they merit special attention. Notably so is that with reference to language. He makes the astounding assertion that we should group together languages because the nations speaking them present similar physical characteristics! I need but ask if there ever lived a scientific linguist to whom this novel system occurred. Dr. Ten Kate acknowledges, that, as yet, no linguistic connection has been shown between American languages and those of the Asiatic Mongols. This is all I asserted.

Nor does my critic attempt to show a single element of Mongolian culture in America. I maintain that this culture is autochthonous; it can all be accounted for by the sociologic history of the nations possessing it; and when such is the case, it is totally unscientific to go elsewhere to seek its origin.

Dr. Ten Kate is most diffuse on somatologic points; and on these he is singularly inconsistent. He argues that the color and character of hair and skin are of little or no importance as race distinction, adducing the Teutons and Italians as examples. I differ with him here, and I deny the correctness of his observations about the color of the American Indians; but grant his position, and does it not also prove the futility of those arguments based upon the alleged identities in these respects of Americans and Mongolians? In either case my thesis would stand intact.

With regard to the relative prevalence of the *ossa Incae*, I must retain my opinion until Dr. Ten Kate is more explicit in his figures, and the same with reference to the glabella. I am prepared to furnish statistics when called upon.

In his paragraph about brachycephaly the critic contradicts not one of my statements, although he asserts that he does. If I have anywhere said that there are no brachycephalic tribes in America,

I should like the passage pointed out. His references to half a dozen authors in this connection are meaningless. Why he finds himself under the necessity of pointing out the distinction between the nasal index as determined on the bony skull and the living face, I know not. American anthropologists do not require instruction in this elementary fact. If he had been familiar with Topinard's 'Elements d'Anthropologie,' to which he refers, and which I quoted in that connection, he would have known that any intimation that I had neglected that distinction was groundless.

I shall not pursue this reply further. The reader may decide whether Dr. Ten Kate has shown a single well-established affinity between the Americans and the Asiatic Mongols. I assert he has not; and I add that such affinities are not more numerous than between the Americans and, say, the Berber tribes of North Africa.

D. G. BRINTON, M.D.

Media, Penn., Nov.

The Theory of the Origin of Species by Natural Selection.

A REMARKABLY clear conception of the elements of the theory for which Charles Darwin has become famous was published almost thirty years prior to the appearance of 'The Origin of Species.'

I have just brought home with me from London a number of geological works published in the early part of this century, among them a copy of Robert Bakewell's 'Introduction to Geology.' The passage I am about to quote from it appeared first in the fourth edition, which was published in 1833; and it is repeated in the fifth edition, published in 1838, with an interesting footnote (see pp. 403, 404).

The author is discussing Deshayes's classification of the various tertiary formations by means of comparison of the faunas with the living species. In the course of the discussion, he refers to the experiments of Robert Bakewell of Dishley, in Leicestershire, in producing choice breeds of sheep by artificial selection. He describes Mr. Bakewell's method as follows:—

"He first travelled over England, and part of the continent, to discover and select animals of the same species, possessing certain peculiarities of form, and other qualities which he was desirous to render permanent. By selecting two animals to breed from, which possessed the desired qualities in an eminent degree, and afterwards selecting from their offspring those in which these qualities were most conspicuous and breeding again from them, the peculiarities were further increased. By continuing the same selection through four or five generations, he obtained races that would transmit the same qualities permanently to succeeding generations."

Then the author applies this principle to explain the appearance of new forms of *Mollusca* in the tertiary beds, as follows:—

"Let us, however, imagine, what is very possible, that a number of individuals of one species of bivalve or univalve shell were driven, during a violent storm, into a distant part of the ocean, where the animals could no longer obtain their accustomed food, but were still able to support life by aliment of a somewhat different kind. Let us suppose that the annoyances to which they had before been subject, from natural enemies or other causes, were changed for annoyances of another kind. Under these different circumstances, is it not probable that the animals themselves would undergo some change, and modify the construction of their shells in some degree, to render them better suited to the new conditions in which they were placed? Thus, in the course of a few generations, we should have a race which conchologists would call a distinct species."

To this the author adds this footnote in the fifth edition (1838): "What was above stated hypothetically in the fourth edition of this work may now be asserted as ascertained facts. Dr. Harlan, a distinguished American naturalist, informed the author that testaceous *Mollusca* removed from one river to another in America were observed in time to change the form of their shells. Mr. Gray, in the Philadelphia Transactions, 1833, states that great varieties of form are produced in shells of the same species, by a removal from calm to agitated water."

Here the chief points of Darwin's theory of the origin of species are expressed. They are founded, also, upon observed facts. The